

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this patent application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3,10-12, and 19 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Tilles et al. in view of Grisley under 35 USC 103; and Claims 4-9,13-18, and 20 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter but being dependent from rejected parent claims. Claims 1,10, and 19 have been cancelled, Claims 21-23 have been inserted, and consequently, Claims 2-9,11-18, and 20-23 are now active in this patent application.

The interview granted by Examiner Choobin is hereby acknowledged and sincerely appreciated as a means for expediting the prosecution of this patent application toward allowance. During the course of the interview, it was noted to the examiner that the present invention was concerned

with a system wherein mail articles are conveyed past a camera viewport disposed within a housing, and that air streams were generated outwardly from the camera housing so as to effectively impinge upon the mail articles and force the same onto the conveying side of a conveyor belt whereby both the conveyor belt and the articles would be conveyed upon an air bearing layer.


It was noted to the examiner, and agreed, that this claimed system was not in fact disclosed within any of the prior art of record. Tilles et al. discloses a conventional conveyor system, and while Grisley discloses an air bearing system for a conveyor belt, the air streams are projected onto to the back or non-conveying side of the conveyor belt. This is different, and in fact opposite, from the present invention wherein the air streams are projected onto the front or conveying side of the conveyor belt upon which the articles are being conveyed. In this manner, both the conveyor belt and the articles being conveyed effectively ride or are conveyed upon the air bearing. It was therefore agreed that newly inserted Claims 21-23 patentably defined

over such prior art of record in that newly inserted Claims 21-23 now clearly set forth these distinguishing features.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that this patent application is now in condition for allowance, and therefore, an early and favorable action to this effect is now anticipated and awaited.

It is lastly noted that this response is being filed within a one-month period of time beyond the normal response due date, and therefore, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account 23-0818 in the amount of \$120.00 for a one-month extension of time fee for a one-month extension of time which is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,  
**SCHWARTZ & WEINRIEB**



---

Steven W. Weinrieb  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 26,520  
(703) 415-1250